LITIGATION ROSTER SPECIAL TAXES

DECEMBER 2008

Special Taxes December 2008

NEW CASES

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court/Case Number</u>

NONE

CLOSED CASES

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court/Case Number</u>

Employers Depot, Inc. Sacramento Superior Court 03AS05773

Special Taxes

LITIGATION ROSTER December 2008

ANVARI, ALI v. State Board of Equalization of California

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CPF-08-508935 Filed – 05/02/08

Plaintiff's CounselBOE's CounselBarzin Barry SabahatBOE Attorney

Anchor Law Group, APC Dana Flanagan-McBeth

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Was the Notice of Determination of Underground Storage Tank Maintenance Fees properly issued and were the subsequent levy actions taken by the Board appropriate. (Health and Safety Code sections 25299.41, 25284; Revenue and Taxation Code sections 50109, 50136, and 50113.1).

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 1/1/97 – 12/6/97 <u>Amount</u>: \$40,196.22

Status: On December 19, 2008, the court sustained BOE's demurrer without leave to amend. Pending appeal.

CALIFORNIA DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION, et al. v. State Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2008-80000082 Filed -11/12/08**BOE's Counsel**

Bob Asperger **BOE Attorney**

Silverstein & Pomerantz LLP Sharon Brady Silva

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Was the tax rate on tobacco products set properly for the 2008/09 fiscal year in determining the wholesale cost of tobacco (<u>Revenue and Tax Code sections 30123, 30126, 30131.2, 30131.5</u>).

Audit/Tax Period: 2008-2009 Amount: Unspecified

Status: Hearing on plaintiff's Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate is set for January 23, 2009.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION I, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

California Supreme Court Case No. S150518

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 04CS00473

Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District Case No. C050289

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David A. Battaglia, Alan N. Bick

Filed – 04/13/04

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004 Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is before the California Supreme Court and is pending scheduling of oral argument.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION II, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05CS00538 Filed – 01/13/05

BOE's CounselPlaintiffs' CounselMolly MosleyDavid A. BattagliaBOE AttorneyGibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLPRenee Carter

<u>ssue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association*, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, case number S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION III, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 06CS00651 Filed - 04/26/06**BOE's Counsel**

Molly Mosley

*David A. Battaglia**

BOE Attorney

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

CA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IV, et al. v. CA State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 07CS00485 Filed – 02/11/08

BOE's Counsel

Plaintiffs' CounselMolly MosleyDavid A. Battaglia, Alan N. BickBOE AttorneyGibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLPRenee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007; 2007-2008

Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

DIAGEO-GUINNESS USA, INC., et al. v. California State Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2008-00013031-CU-JR-GDS Filed – 06/12/08

Plaintiff's CounselBOE's CounselElizabeth Mann, Jeffrey N. GoldbergSteven J. GreenMcDermot, Will & Emery LLPBOE AttorneyJeffrey Graybill

<u>Issue(s)</u>: (1) Whether BOE has the authority to adopt new Alcoholic Beverage Tax Regulations <u>2558</u>, <u>2559</u>, <u>2559.1</u>, <u>2559.3</u> and <u>2559.5</u> ("Regulations") recently approved by the Office of Administrative Law on June 10, 2008; (2) whether the Regulations are consistent with governing law; (3) whether BOE is required to follow federal regulations in this area; (4) whether BOE failed to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act; and (5) whether the Regulations violate the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution (Revenue and Taxation Code sections <u>32002</u>, <u>32152</u>, <u>32451</u> and Business and Professions Code sections <u>23004</u>, <u>23005</u>, <u>23006</u>, <u>23007</u>).

Audit/Tax Period: None Amount: \$0.00

<u>Status:</u> Hearing on plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Adjudication of Issues and on BOE's Motion for Summary Judgment is scheduled for January 27, 2009.

EQUILON ENTERPRISES LLC, et al. v. California State Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05AS02406 Filed – 06/01/05
Court of Appeal, Third Appellate Dist. No. C059079

Plaintiffs' Counsel
Thomas H. Steele, Pilar M. Sansone
Morrison & Forrester LLP

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05AS02406

BOE's Counsel
Molly Mosley
BOE Attorney
Carolee Johnstone

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Validity of the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention fee (<u>Health and Safety Code sections 105275-105310</u>) as it applies to Equilon Enterprises LLC, et al.

Audit/Tax Period: 2002 Amount: \$3,910,359.10

<u>Status</u>: Trial court judgment was entered on April 8, 2008 in favor of defendants. Equilon's Notice of Appeal was filed June 4, 2008. Preparation of the record on appeal is continuing.

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. v. California Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 07CS00054 Filed – 01/12/07

BOE's Counsel
Jeff Rich

Plaintiff's Counsel

William D. Taylor, Eli R. Makus

Hanson, Bridgett, Marcus, Vlahos & Rudy, LLP

BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether consumption of diesel fuel used to operate air conditioning systems on buses was exempt from the diesel fuel tax (<u>Revenue and Taxation Code section 60501(a)(4)(A)</u>; <u>Regulation 1432</u>).

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 08/01/01-12/31/03; 01/01/04-06/30/05 <u>Amount</u>: \$295,583.04

Status: Trial preparation. Discovery continues.

MORNING STAR COMPANY v. The State Board of Equalization, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2008-00005600-CU-MC-GDS Filed – 03/06/08

Plaintiff's Counsel

Molly Mosley

Brian C. Leighton, Richard Todd Luoma

Attorneys at Law

BOE Attorney

Mike Llewellyn

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the requirement to pay fees into the Toxic Substances Control Account (<u>Health & Safety Code section 25205.6</u>, <u>subdivision (c)</u>) complies with the Administrative Procedure Act and due process.

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 01/01/03-12/31/05 <u>Amount</u>: \$38,698.92

Status: BOE's answer was filed May 12, 2008.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION I, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

California Superior Court Case No. S150518 Filed – 12/17/03

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776

Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District: 03CS01776

BOE's Counsel

<u>Plaintiffs' Counsel</u> Molly Mosley

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004 Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is before the California Supreme Court and is pending the scheduling of oral arguments.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION, II, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 04CS01467 Filed – 10/29/04

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Molly Mosley

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly

BOE Attorney

Somach, Simmons & Dunn Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; <u>1550-1552</u>; and <u>1560</u>).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION, III, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 05CS01488 Filed – 10/19/05

Plaintiffs' Counsel
Stuart I. Somach Daniel Kelly

ROE Attorney

Stuart L. Somach, Daniel Kelly
Somach, Simmons & Dunn

BOE Attorney
Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION, IV, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 06CS01517 Filed – 10/18/06

BOE's CounselPlaintiffs' CounselMolly MosleyStuart L. Somach, Daniel KellyBOE AttorneySomach, Simmons & DunnRenee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION, V, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2008-00003004-CU-WM-GDS Filed – 02/07/08

Plaintiffs' CounselBOE's CounselStuart L. Somach, Daniel KellyMolly MosleySomach, Simmons & DunnBOE AttorneyRenee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2007-2008 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association*, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, case number S150518.

PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Riverside Superior Court Case No. INC 043178

Filed - 05/28/04

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

David R. Saunders

Clayson, Mann, Yaeger & Hansen

Filed - 05/28/04

BOE's Counsel

Molly Mosley

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 is valid (<u>Water Code sections 1525-1530</u>; <u>1535-1541</u>; 1550-1552; and 1560).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004 Amount: Unspecified

<u>Status</u>: This case is stayed pending the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, case number S150518.

PARMAR, ASHOK V., et al. v. California State Board of Equalization

Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC379013 Filed – 10/11/2007

aintiffs' Counsel Ron Ito

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Marty Dakessian, Aleen L. Khanjian

Ron Ito

BOE Attorney

Dakessian & Associates, PLC Dana Flanagan-McBeth

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the BOE issued the Notice of Determination to the correct entity and whether plaintiff intentionally evaded payment of excise taxes as a distributor defined under <u>Revenue and Taxation</u> <u>Code sections 30008</u> and 30009.

Audit/Tax Period: 12/16/93-03/08/95 Amount: \$87,647.00

Status: On November 26, 2008, the court issued its tentative ruling in favor of plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' Proposed Statement of Decision and Proposed Judgment were served December 30, 2008. BOE has until January 14, 2009 to file objections.

SANTA CLARA, COUNTY OF, et al. v. State Board of Equalization of California

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CPF-06-506789 Filed – 11/15/06

Plaintiffs' Counsel
Louise H. Renne, K. Scott Dickey
Renne, Sloan, Holtzman, Sakai LLP

BOE's Counsel
Llewellyn/Graybill
Llewellyn/Graybill

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the BOE is under a mandatory duty to tax flavored malt beverages as distilled spirits under Revenue and Taxation Code section 32451.

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: None <u>Amount</u>: Unspecified

Status: Civil proceedings are stayed pending the rule-making process. The Office of Administrative Law (OAL) approved the Board's regulatory changes on June 10, 2008, and sent them to the Secretary of State. The new regulations, adding clarification to the definition of "distilled spirits", are operative October 1, 2008. Industry has challenged the validity of the regulations, in the case known as *Diageo-Guinness USA*, *Inc. v. BOE*, reported above.

SHAITRIT, ASHER v. California State Board of Equalization

San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2008-00094283 Filed – 11/15/06

BOE's Counsel

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Leslie Branman Smith

Frederick C. Phillips
Phillips, Haskett & Ingwalson
Gregory Day

<u>Issue(s)</u>: The issue in this case is whether plaintiff, a licensed distributor of cigarettes, purchased and distributed unstamped cigarettes subject to the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax Law (Revenue and Taxation Code section 30000 et seq.).

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 5/1/99 – 5/31/01 <u>Amount</u>: \$157,871.09

Status: BOE's Answer and Cross-Complaint were filed December 17, 2008.

SILVERS, STEPHEN F., et al. v. State Board of Equalization, et al.

Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC388468 Filed -04/04/08BOE's Counsel

Plaintiffs' Counsel

William K. Hanagami

The Hanagami Law Firm

Piled -04/04/08BOE's Counsel

Diane Shaw

BOE Attorney

Renee Carter

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether BOE has a duty and obligation to assess insurance taxes against Lexington Insurance Company, a Delaware Corporation and non-admitted insurer (<u>Insurance Code section 1760, et seq. and 1763.1</u>).

Audit/Tax Period: None Amount: \$0.00

<u>Status</u>: Hearing on defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and Summary Adjudication of Issues is set for March 12, 2009. Final Status Conference and Mandatory Settlement Conference are scheduled for April 3, 2009. Trial is set for April 13, 2009.

SMILAND PAINT COMPANY, et al. v. California Department of Health Services, et al.

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 01CS01318 Filed – 09/14/01

Plaintiffs' Counsel
William L. Carter
William M. Smiland, William Chase Ahders

BOE's Counsel
William L. Carter
BOE Attorney

Smiland & Khachigian Mike Llewellyn

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (CLLP) fee under the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1991 (<u>Health and Safety Code sections 105275–105310</u>) are properly imposed on plaintiff who never manufactured or distributed lead-based products.

Audit/Tax Period: None Amount: \$2,400,000.00

Status: Civil proceedings are stayed pending bankruptcy.

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, L.P. v. State Board of Equalization

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-06-455982 Filed – 09/07/06

BOE's CounselPlaintiff's CounselWang/StandenRichard N. WileyBOE AttorneyAttorney at LawCarolee Johnstone

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the BOE appropriately applied the Emergency Telephone Users Surcharge (<u>Revenue and Taxation Code section 41001 et seq.</u>) to certain charges Sprint bills to its California customers.

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 12/01/97-04/30/00 <u>Amount</u>: \$2,289,936.82

Status: Oral argument at the trial was held November 14, 2008 – pending decision.

U.S. SMOKELESS TOBACCO BRANDS INC. v. State Board of Equalization

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-07-463592 Filed – 05/22/07

Plaintiff's CounselBOE's CounselAmy L. Silverstein, Edwin P. AntolinJulian O. StandenBOE Attorney

Silverstein & Pomerantz LLP Sharon Brady Silva

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Revenue & Taxation Code section 30123 requires distributors of tobacco products to pay an excise tax on distribution of tobacco products based on the wholesale cost of the products. Plaintiff purchased the product from an affiliated manufacturing corporation owned by the same parent company. Plaintiff contends that the taxable wholesale cost should be based on its price to purchase from the manufacturer, rather than its sales price to distributors, which it previously used to calculate the tax base.

Audit/Tax Period: 01/94-11/96 Amount: \$725,977.90

<u>Status</u>: Trial held September 9, 2008, September 22, 2008 and September 24, 2008. Judge to enter interim proposed decision, with oral argument to be held in February 2009.

ULTRAMAR, INC. v. S. Kimberly Belshe, et al.

USDC, Central Dist. CA Case No. CV 04-6468 MRP

<u>Plaintiff's Counsel</u> Richard E. Nielsen

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman LLP

Filed – 08/04/04

<u>BOE's Counsel</u>

Elisa Wolfe

<u>BOE Attorney</u>

Carolee Johnstone

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Ultramar, Inc., a paint manufacturer, contends that certain regulations issued with respect to the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (CLPP) fee (<u>Health and Safety Code sections 105275 – 105310</u>) should be declared invalid and unconstitutional and that the BOE and Department of Public Health should be enjoined from enforcing the CLPP program and collecting and assessing the CLPP fee against Ultramar.

<u>Audit/Tax Period</u>: 1991-1999 and 2001 <u>Amount</u>: \$6,348,189.19

<u>Status</u>: The lawsuit was stayed by the District Court on July 14, 2005, after an abstention and sovereign immunity (11th amendment) motion was heard by the court.

SPECIAL TAXES CLOSED CASES LITIGATION ROSTER

December 2008

EMPLOYERS DEPOT, INC. v. The State Board of Equalization

Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 03AS05773

Plaintiff's Counsel
Peter J. Celeste
Professional Law Corporation

Filed – 10/16/03

<u>BOE's Counsel</u>

Amy J. Winn

<u>BOE Attorney</u>

Mike Llewellyn

<u>Issue(s)</u>: Whether the requirement to pay fees into the Toxic Substances Control Account (<u>Health & Safety</u> Code section 25205.6, subdivision (c)) complies with the Administrative Procedure Act and due process.

Audit/Tax Period: 1997-2001 Amount: Unspecified

Disposition: Case settled. Dismissal entered December 29, 2008.

DISCLAIMER

Every attempt has been made to ensure the information contained herein is valid and accurate at the time of publication. However, the tax laws are complex and subject to change. If there is a conflict between the law and the information found, decisions will be made based on the law.

Links to information on sites not maintained by the Board of Equalization are provided only as a public service. The Board is not responsible for the content and accuracy of the information on those sites.